

Exact overlaps in the Kondo problem

Sergei L. Lukyanov¹, Hubert Saleur^{1,2,3}, Jesper L. Jacobsen^{4,5} and Romain Vasseur^{6,7}

¹*Physics Department, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ, USA*

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089, USA*

³*Institut de Physique Théorique, CEA Saclay, 91191 Gif Sur Yvette, France*

⁴*LPTENS, École Normale Supérieure, 24 rue Lhomond, 75231 Paris, France*

⁵*Université Pierre et Marie Curie, 4 place Jussieu, 75252 Paris, France*

⁶*Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA and*

⁷*Materials Science Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratories, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

(Dated: November 7, 2014)

It is well known that the ground states of a Fermi liquid with and without a single Kondo impurity have an overlap which decays as a power law of the system size, expressing the Anderson orthogonality catastrophe. Ground states with two different values of the Kondo couplings have, however, a finite overlap in the thermodynamic limit. This overlap, which plays an important role in quantum quenches for impurity systems, is a universal function of the ratio of the corresponding Kondo temperatures, which is not accessible using perturbation theory nor the Bethe ansatz. Using a strategy based on the integrable structure of the corresponding quantum field theory, we propose an exact formula for this overlap, which we check against extensive density matrix renormalization group calculations.

PACS numbers: 72.15.Qm, 74.40.Gh, 05.70.Ln

Introduction. The Anderson orthogonality catastrophe (AOC) is one of the cornerstones of modern many body physics. In its simplest formulation, this “catastrophe” states that the ground states of two Fermi seas with different local scattering potentials become (if the orthogonality exponent is non zero), orthogonal in the thermodynamic limit. This fact has many important consequences, and is at the root of the physics of Mahan excitons [1], the Fermi edge singularity in absorption spectra [2], the non linear I_V characteristics in quantum dots, or the Kondo effect [3] in magnetic alloys. More recently, AOC has played a central role in understanding the post quench dynamics induced by optical absorption in quantum dots tunnel-coupled to Fermi seas [4, 5].

The simplest manifestation of AOC occurs in the case of a free Fermi sea involving a single channel of non interacting electrons that experience two different local scattering potentials. If the corresponding phase shifts at the Fermi energy are $\delta_F^{(1)}, \delta_F^{(2)}$, a simple argument [6] shows that the scalar product of the ground states vanishes as

$$\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle \propto N^{-(\delta_F^{(1)} - \delta_F^{(2)})^2 / 2\pi^2}, \quad (1)$$

where N is the total number of electrons. AOC occurs as well in interacting systems. In the k -channel Kondo problem for instance, it is known that the scalar product of the system with and without a Kondo impurity behaves as $\langle \Omega(J) | \Omega(J=0) \rangle \propto N^{-d_K}$ where [7] $d_K = \frac{3}{4(k+2)}$ and J is the (antiferromagnetic) Kondo coupling. The simplest one-channel case, to which we will restrict in this Letter, corresponds then to $d_K = \frac{1}{4}$. In this case, the orthogonality of the ground states expresses the fact that at very low energy, spin up and spin down electrons see a phase shift of 0 (resp. $\frac{\pi}{2}$) with zero (resp. non zero) Kondo coupling. An easy generalization of this argument

gives the exponent in the anisotropic Kondo case as well: in the Toulouse limit in particular, $d_K^{(\text{Tou})} = \frac{1}{8}$. No such simple Fermi liquid calculation exists for $k > 1$, and sophisticated techniques have to be used to calculate the overlap, such as integrability or conformal invariance. In the latter set-up, the orthogonality exponent d_K is interpreted as the scaling dimension of a boundary condition changing operator [7]. Note that such exponents are directly related to the power law tail in the so-called work distribution [8, 9] for quenches when a coupling is suddenly turned on, such as those studied in Refs. [4, 5] in the Kondo case.

The ground state overlap exemplifies the *non perturbative* quantities occurring in quantum impurity problems. An interesting variant is provided by the overlap $\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle$ between ground states corresponding to two different non-vanishing Kondo couplings $J^{(1)}, J^{(2)}$. This overlap is not expected to vanish when both $J^{(1)}, J^{(2)} \neq 0$, even in the thermodynamic limit. This is because, for any non zero Kondo coupling, fermions at very low energy now see the same phase shift of $\frac{\pi}{2}$. Nevertheless, this overlap is non trivial, even in the non interacting Toulouse limit, because it is determined by the behavior of the whole Fermi sea, and not just what happens at the Fermi energy. This overlap is also *non perturbative*: any attempt to calculate it by expanding in $J^{(1)}, J^{(2)}$ is plagued by infrared divergences precisely because of the AOC. Overlaps such as $\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle$ arise in quantum quenches where one suddenly changes the Kondo coupling $J^{(1)} \mapsto J^{(2)}$. The system then has a finite probability of remaining in the ground state at large times, which translates into a delta function in the corresponding work distribution [8]: this probability is precisely the square modulus $P_{1 \rightarrow 2} = |\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle|^2$, and it could be measured

in optical absorption experiments realizing such quantum quenches [4, 5].

Now, the Kondo problem exhibits universal properties at energy scales much smaller than the bandwidth D . In this limit, physical quantities depend only on the temperature, the magnetic field, and a crossover scale which encodes the Kondo coupling J (see their precise relationship below) – the Kondo temperature T_K . Different (proportional) definitions of T_K exist, but this will not matter for us. Indeed, provided $T_K^{(1)}, T_K^{(2)} \ll D$, scaling arguments show that the overlap becomes a universal function of the ratio

$$\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle = F(T_K^{(1)}/T_K^{(2)}) = F(T_K^{(2)}/T_K^{(1)}) . \quad (2)$$

In this Letter, we obtain an exact formula for this quantity, which we also check with extensive Density Matrix Renormalization Group (DMRG) calculations.

Anisotropic Kondo model. The anisotropic Kondo problem is initially formulated as a three dimensional problem of non interacting fermions coupled to a local magnetic impurity. After a spherical waves decomposition, only the s -channel interacts with the impurity, and the problem can be transformed into one dimensional gapless fermions on the half line (the radial coordinate) coupled to a spin at the origin. “Unfolding” the half line one obtains a problem of chiral fermions with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H} = & -i v_F \sum_{\alpha=\uparrow,\downarrow} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \psi_{\alpha}^{\dagger} \partial_x \psi_{\alpha} \\ & + J (j^+(0) \sigma^- + j^-(0) \sigma^+) + J_z j^z(0) \sigma^z , \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the spin currents are $j^+ = \psi_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \psi_{\downarrow}$, $j^- = \psi_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \psi_{\uparrow}$, $j^z = \psi_{\uparrow}^{\dagger} \psi_{\uparrow} - \psi_{\downarrow}^{\dagger} \psi_{\downarrow}$. We bosonize the fermionic fields $\psi_{\sigma} \sim e^{i\sqrt{4\pi}\phi_{\sigma}}$ [10], which allows us to separate charge and spin modes $\phi_{c/s} = (\phi_{\uparrow} \pm \phi_{\downarrow})/\sqrt{2}$. The charge boson decouples, and the interacting part involves only the spin boson $\phi = \phi_s$. After a canonical transformation, $\mathbf{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{U}^{\dagger} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{U}$ with $\mathbf{U} = \exp(iJ_z \phi(0) \sigma_z)$, one can then rewrite the Hamiltonian as

$$\mathbf{H} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx (\partial_x \phi)^2 + J (e^{i\beta\phi(0)} \sigma^- + e^{-i\beta\phi(0)} \sigma^+) , \quad (4)$$

with $\beta = \sqrt{8\pi} - 2J_z$ and the equal time commutation relations $[\phi(x), \phi(x')] = \frac{i}{4} \text{sign}(x - x')$. The scaling dimension of the perturbation is $\frac{\beta^2}{8\pi} = \left(1 - \frac{J_z}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^2 \equiv \frac{\xi}{\xi+1}$ where the last equality defines the coupling constant ξ . The Kondo temperature in this framework varies as $T_K \propto J^{\xi+1}$.

Perturbative results. It is first natural to try to evaluate the universal function (2) using perturbation theory. To this end, we fold the chiral problem (4) to obtain a non-chiral boson on the half line $(-\infty, 0]$, scattering off the spin impurity at $x = 0$. We then map this $(1+1)D$




FIG. 1: The overlap $|\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle|$ can be extracted from the partition function of the system with the insertion of a Kondo impurity and two different values of the coupling. In this picture, the boundary condition corresponds to the spin impurity while the bulk describes a critical statistical mechanics problem associated with the spin mode ϕ_s .

quantum impurity system onto a $2D$ classical statistical mechanics problem in the half-plane, critical in the bulk (corresponding to the $c = 1$ free boson theory), with the impurity now acting as a boundary condition (see Fig. 1). We then calculate the partition function $\mathcal{Z}(J^{(1)}, J^{(2)})$ of a half-infinite system with boundary condition corresponding to the Kondo temperature $T_K^{(1)}$ everywhere except on a part of the boundary of length τ where the boundary field is taken to correspond to $T_K^{(2)}$. It gives a term linear in imaginary time (corresponding to a boundary free energy contribution), a term exponential in imaginary time (corresponding to excited states propagating along the boundary), and a term of order one which can be seen to be $|\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle|^2$ in the Hamiltonian formalism.

Expanding the overlap $|\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle|^2$ in $J^{(1)} - J^{(2)}$ from the ratio $\mathcal{Z}(J^{(1)}, J^{(2)})/\mathcal{Z}(J^{(1)}, J^{(1)})$ is extremely complicated, since the two-point function of the boundary perturbation in (4) is not known in general. At the Toulouse point ($\xi = 1$), however, the perturbation can be reffermionized, so the spin-spin propagator at finite value of J is easily found, and expanding the partition function yields [11]

$$|\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle|_{\xi=1} = 1 - \frac{\alpha_{12}^2}{8\pi^2} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_{12}^4), \quad (5)$$

where $e^{\alpha_{12}} = T_K^{(2)}/T_K^{(1)}$. Even for this non-interacting case, going beyond this first order expansion becomes quickly involved, and capturing the full behavior of the function (2) seems hopeless.

Semi-classical analysis. The overlap can also be calculated perturbatively in the semiclassical limit, where

$\xi \simeq \frac{\beta^2}{8\pi} \ll 1$. In this case, it is convenient to implement yet another canonical transformation, and bring the Hamiltonian into the form

$$\mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^0 dx ((\partial_x \Phi)^2 + (\partial_t \Phi)^2) + J\sigma^x + \frac{\beta}{4} \partial_t \Phi(0) \sigma^z. \quad (6)$$

Using perturbation theory in β , we now calculate the partition function $\mathcal{Z}$ in imaginary time of a system with two different values of J as shown in Fig. 1. The leading contribution comes from the configuration where $\sigma^x = -1$ everywhere but between a pair of insertions, spaced by τ , of the $\partial_t \Phi(0) \sigma^z$ term. Discarding terms that depend on τ and encode the non universal boundary free energy, we find [11]

$$|\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle| = 1 + \frac{\xi}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_{12}}{2} \coth \frac{\alpha_{12}}{2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\xi^2). \quad (7)$$

Once again, going beyond this first order is extremely involved, and there is, in particular, no chance to capture the crossover between the two extreme behaviors, $T_K^{(1)} \sim T_K^{(2)}$ and $T_K^{(1)} \gg T_K^{(2)}$.

Exact results from integrability. For many other questions in the Kondo problem – such as the study of thermodynamics properties [12, 13], correlation functions [14], quantum quenches [15] or entanglement [16] – non perturbative techniques have led to analytic expressions in the crossover regions, when the physical scale of interest (temperature, magnetic field, etc) is comparable with T_K . Although exact Bethe ansatz wave functions are in principle known for different values of T_K , overlaps such as $\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle$, have however proven, so far, impossibly hard to calculate directly. We report here another approach to the problem based on an axiomatic determination of the overlaps directly in the field theory limit. This approach is similar in philosophy to the S -matrix bootstrap from Ref. [17]. We give the relevant details in the supplementary material, and move directly to the main result.

We find that the overlap is given by

$$\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle = (\xi + 1) \frac{\sinh \frac{\alpha_{12}}{2(\xi+1)}}{\sinh \frac{\alpha_{12}}{2}} g_\xi(\alpha_{12}) \quad (8)$$

with

$$g_\xi(\alpha) = \exp \left(\int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} \frac{\sin^2(\alpha t/\pi)}{\sinh 2t \cosh t} \frac{\sinh t\xi}{\sinh t(\xi+1)} \right), \quad (9)$$

where we recall that $e^{\alpha_{12}} = T_K^{(2)}/T_K^{(1)}$. See Fig. 2 for a plot of this exact solution, illustrating the variation of the overlap with the anisotropy, as well as the incredibly large values of the ratio $T_K^{(2)}/T_K^{(1)}$ necessary to bring this overlap down to the 10^{-1} or less. It is worth mentioning here that the function $g_\xi(\alpha_{12})$ coincides with properly




FIG. 2: Theoretical result for the overlap for various anisotropies as a function of the ratio $T_K^{(2)}/T_K^{(1)}$. The isotropic Kondo problem then corresponds to $\xi = \infty$. Note the extreme values on the x -axis.

normalized matrix elements of the operators $e^{\pm i\beta\phi(0)} \sigma^\mp$:

$$\frac{\langle \Omega_2 | e^{\pm i\beta\phi(0)} \sigma^\mp | \Omega_1 \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle \Omega_2 | e^{-i\beta\phi(0)} \sigma^+ | \Omega_2 \rangle \langle \Omega_1 | e^{+i\beta\phi(0)} \sigma^- | \Omega_1 \rangle}} = g_\xi(\alpha_{12}). \quad (10)$$

An immediate check is to study the behavior at large $T_K^{(2)}/T_K^{(1)}$, where we find

$$\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle \simeq \begin{cases} C_\xi \left(\frac{T_K^{(2)}}{T_K^{(1)}} \right)^{-\frac{\xi}{4(\xi+1)}} & (\xi < \infty) \\ C_\infty \left(\log \frac{T_K^{(2)}}{T_K^{(1)}} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\frac{T_K^{(2)}}{T_K^{(1)}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} & (\xi = \infty) \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

for $T_K^{(2)} \gg T_K^{(1)}$. This is in agreement with the dimension of the boundary condition changing operator for the anisotropic Kondo problem, $d_K = \frac{1}{4} \frac{\xi}{\xi+1}$. For the isotropic Kondo case ($\xi = \infty$) we recover the dimension, $d_K = \frac{1}{4}$, of the $j = \frac{1}{2}$ $SU(2)$ primary. Notice that, since in eq. (8) we assume the conventional normalization condition $\langle \Omega | \Omega \rangle = 1$, the constants in asymptotic formulae (11) are universal amplitudes. Their expression can be found in the supplementary material. Of course, one can also verify that (8) is consistent with the perturbative results (5) and (7).

Numerical results. We now turn to a detailed numerical exploration of our result. There are various lattice models where the overlap (8) can be measured. We have focused on the XXZ chain with a weak boundary coupling

$$H = \sum_{i=0}^N t_i (S_i^x S_{i+1}^x + S_i^y S_{i+1}^y + \Delta S_i^z S_{i+1}^z), \quad (12)$$

where $t_i = 1$ for $i \neq 0$ and $t_0 = J_\ell$. Standard bosonization [18] shows that this Hamiltonian is equivalent, at




FIG. 3: Numerical checks of the main result (8). Note that the comparison between numerical and field theory results does not involve any free parameter. (a) Measures of the overlap in the free-fermion Toulouse case $\xi = 1$, modeled by a spinless non-interacting resonant level, tunnel-coupled with parameter J_ℓ to two metallic reservoirs with $N = 4096$ sites each. The dashed line is the analytical result, with $T_K \propto J_\ell^2$. Inset: Finite size scaling. (b) DMRG results for the overlap in the interacting case $\xi = 1/3$, modeled by an XXZ spin chain with anisotropy $\Delta = -1/\sqrt{2}$ and N sites, with an extra site at the edge characterized by a weak link J_ℓ , corresponding to the impurity. The numerical results for $N = 200, \dots, 800$ are extrapolated in the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. The red line is the analytical result, with $T_K \propto J_\ell^{4/3}$, and the black symbols correspond to the extrapolation $J_\ell \rightarrow 0$. Inset: Examples of finite size extrapolations for fixed $J_\ell \equiv J_\ell^{(1)}$ and different values of $J_\ell^{(2)}$.

low energy, to (4) with the Kondo coupling $J \propto J_\ell$ and $\frac{\beta^2}{8\pi} = 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \arccos \Delta$ [32]. From a numerical point of view, the easiest case to check is of course the Toulouse point where $\Delta = 0$, for which the overlap (2) can be expressed as a determinant of a matrix whose size scales linearly with the number of sites (see e.g. [19]). Results are presented in Fig. 3(a). While the agreement with the theoretical value is clearly good – note that there is no free parameter in (8) – several aspects are important to notice. First, the overlap varies very slowly with the ratio of Kondo temperatures. This requires exploring ratios $T_K^{(2)}/T_K^{(1)}$ of the order of 10^2 or more. Since the analytical result is only true in the scaling limit where $J_\ell \ll 1$, this forces us to explore extremely small values of the bare coupling. For these values, the Kondo screening length $1/T_K \propto (J_\ell)^{-2}$ is in turn very large. To avoid finite size effects – which seem quite important for the determination of the overlaps – we finally have to study larger systems than one would have expected – of the order of 10^4 sites, forbidding us in particular from testing the region where the overlap becomes very small.

The interacting case requires use of the DMRG technique [20]. We use here a two-site version in the matrix product state (MPS) language [21]. In this case, we have been limited to chains of about 800 sites, for which finite size effects in the scaling limit remain unfortunately important. In order to obtain usable results, we have had to perform a *double extrapolation*. For finite, small J_ℓ we have first extrapolated results for different sizes to $N = \infty$. These results are represented in Fig. 3(b) for

$\xi = 1/3$. We have then performed a second extrapolation for different values of J_ℓ to $J_\ell = 0$, represented by the black symbols in the figure. The result of these extrapolations is found to be consistent with the analytical result (8). Note that in principle, one would also need to extrapolate the bond dimension χ of the variational MPS used in DMRG to infinity, but we find that keeping $\chi \sim 100 - 300$ was enough for the finite χ effects to be negligible compared with the more important finite N and finite J_ℓ effects.

Discussion. It is clear a posteriori – in view of its extremely slow variation with the ratio of Kondo temperatures – that the overlap in the crossover would be impossible to obtain perturbatively. It is also difficult to measure it numerically. The slow variation quantifies the weak dependency of the Kondo ground state on the impurity coupling. It would be interesting to obtain a more qualitative understanding of this effect in terms of the screening cloud. Technically, the exact formula for the ground states overlap is the building stone for the calculation of general overlaps between quantum impurity systems with different boundary conditions. Exact calculations of Loschmidt echoes and work distributions in quantum quenches then follow using more traditional techniques [22], which will be discussed elsewhere.

Despite their importance in the context of quantum information, the thermodynamic limit of similar ground state overlaps (fidelities) remain extremely difficult to access exactly – even for non-interacting systems – and are often non-perturbative in the relevant expansion param-

eters. Our result opens the door to the calculation of such overlaps in integrable systems.

Acknowledgments. We thank I. Affleck, N. Andrei, J. Dubail, F.H.L. Essler, A.M. Tsvelick and A.B. Zamolodchikov for useful discussions. HS gratefully acknowledges the hospitality of the Rutgers Physics Department where this work was started. The work of HS and JJ was supported by the French Agence Nationale pour la Recherche (ANR Projet 2010 Blanc SIMI 4: DIME); the work of HS was also supported by the DOE under grant number DE-FG03-01ER45908. The work of RV was supported by the Quantum Materials program of LBNL, and the work of SL was supported by the NSF under grant number NSF-PHY-1404056.

els of quantum field theory (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992).

-
- [1] G.D. Mahan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18**, 448 (1967).
 - [2] P. Nozières, J. Gavoret and B. Roulet, Phys. Rev. **178**, 1084 (1969).
 - [3] A. Hewson, *The Kondo problem to heavy fermions*, Cambridge studies in Magnetism (Cambridge University Press, 1993).
 - [4] H.E. Türeci *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 107402 (2011).
 - [5] C. Latta *et al*, Nature **474**, 627, (2011).
 - [6] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18**, 1049 (1967).
 - [7] I. Affleck and A. Ludwig, J. Phys. A **27**, 5375 (1994).
 - [8] A. Silva, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 120603 (2008); A. Gambassi and A. Silva, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 250602 (2012).
 - [9] M. Heyl and S. Kehrein, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 155413 (2012).
 - [10] T. Giamarchi, *Quantum physics in one dimension* (Oxford University Press, 2003).
 - [11] See supplemental material.
 - [12] A.M. Tsvelick and P.B. Wiegmann, Adv. in Phys. **32**, 453 (1983).
 - [13] N. Andrei, K. Furuya and F. Lowenstein, Rev. Mod. Phys. **55**, 331 (1983).
 - [14] F. Lesage, H. Saleur and S. Skorik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3388 (1996).
 - [15] R. Vasseur, K. Trinh, S. Haas and H. Saleur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 240601 (2013).
 - [16] R. Vasseur, J.L. Jacobsen and H. Saleur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 106601 (2014).
 - [17] A. Zamolodchikov and Al. Zamolodchikov, Annals Phys. **120**, 253 (1979).
 - [18] I. Affleck, J. Phys. A **31**, 2761 (1998).
 - [19] J.M. Stéphan and J. Dubail, J. Stat. Mech. P08019 (2011).
 - [20] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2863 (1992).
 - [21] U. Schollwöck, Ann. Phys. **326**, 96 (2011).
 - [22] F. Lesage and H. Saleur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4370 (1998).
 - [23] V.V. Bazhanov, S.L. Lukyanov, A.B. Zamolodchikov, Comm. Math. Phys. **177** (2), 381 (1996).
 - [24] S. Lukyanov, Phys. Lett. B **325**, 409 (1994).
 - [25] P. Fendley, H. Saleur and N.P. Werner, Nucl. Phys B **470**, 577 (1994).
 - [26] S. Lukyanov, Comm. Math. Phys. **167**, 183 (1995).
 - [27] P. Fendley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2485 (1993).
 - [28] F. Smirnov, *Form factors in completely integrable models of quantum field theory* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992).
 - [29] A. Leclair, F. Lesage and H. Saleur, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 13597 (1996).
 - [30] S. Ghoshal and A.B. Zamolodchikov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **9**, 3841 (1994).
 - [31] B.M. McCoy, Phys. Rev. **188** (2), 1014 (1969).
 - [32] Note that the interaction term $J_\ell \Delta S_0^z S_1^z$ on the weak link is marginal, but can nevertheless be ignored in (4) since it appears with amplitude $J_\ell \rightarrow 0$ in the scaling limit.

Supplementary material

A. Quantum Jost operators and overlaps

Here we present some details of the derivation of (8). Integrability of the Kondo problem has most often been used to find exact wave functions with the Bethe ansatz. While this should, in principle, give access to quantities such as the ground states overlap, this would require many technical steps. We shall proceed here differently, by exploiting integrability directly at the field theory level in a spirit of the seminal work [17].

We start from the Hamiltonian in the form (4) with an infinitesimally small positive magnetic field added

$$\mathbf{H} = H_0 - h \sigma^z + J \left(e^{i\beta\phi(0)} \sigma^- + e^{-i\beta\phi(0)} \sigma^+ \right) ; \quad H_0 = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx (\partial_x \phi)^2 , \quad h \rightarrow 0^+ . \quad (13)$$

Recall that the Kondo temperature varies (for constant $\xi \equiv \frac{\beta^2}{8\pi - \beta^2}$) as $T_K \propto J^{\xi+1}$. Consider the interaction picture, treating the term $\propto J$ as a perturbation. Let us perform a Wick rotation, $t \mapsto y = it$, so that for the Bose field in the interaction picture $\phi(x, y) = \phi(x + iy)$. Introduce the y -ordered exponent

$$\mathbf{S}(y_2, y_1) = \mathcal{T}_y \exp \left(- \int_{y_1}^{y_2} dy J \left(e^{i\beta\phi(0,y)} e^{2hy} \sigma^- + e^{-i\beta\phi(0,y)} e^{-2hy} \sigma^+ \right) \right) \quad (14)$$

and

$$\mathbf{T}_J^{(-)} = e^{\frac{i}{2}\beta\phi(0,0)\sigma^z} \mathbf{S}(0, -L) , \quad \mathbf{T}_J^{(+)} = \mathbf{S}(+L, 0) e^{-\frac{i}{2}\beta\phi(0,0)\sigma^z} , \quad (15)$$

which are operators acting on the impurity spin, whose matrix elements are themselves operators acting on the free bosonic degrees of freedom. Notice that the conjugation condition $(e^{i\beta\phi(0,y)} \sigma^-)^\dagger = e^{-i\beta\phi(0,-y)} \sigma^+$ leads to the relation $\mathbf{T}_J^{(+)} = (\mathbf{T}_J^{(-)})^\dagger$. Take now the adiabatic limit $L \rightarrow +\infty$ assuming that the interaction is switching on (off) adiabatically. In the absence of interaction and for $h > 0$, the vacuum state for (13) is given by the product $|\uparrow\rangle \otimes |\text{vac}\rangle$, where $|\text{vac}\rangle$ stands for the ground state of H_0 and $|\uparrow\rangle$ is a spin-up eigenvector of σ^z . With the common physical intuition it is expected that the following limits exist and define the so-called Jost operators:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty}^{(\text{adiab})} \mathbf{T}_J^{(-)} |\uparrow\rangle &= T_+(\alpha) |\uparrow\rangle + T_-(\alpha) |\downarrow\rangle \\ \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{L \rightarrow +\infty}^{(\text{adiab})} \langle \uparrow | \mathbf{T}_J^{(+)} &= \langle \uparrow | T_+^\dagger(\alpha) + \langle \downarrow | T_-^\dagger(\alpha) , \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where we use the parameterization $J \propto e^{-\alpha/(\xi+1)}$.

Let us introduce the complex coordinate $z = x + iy$ and the polar angle $\psi = \arg(iz)$. It is well known that the generator of infinitesimal Euclidean rotations coincides with $(-iK)$, where K is the Lorentz boost generator. The Jost operators defined by eq. (16) are related through the Euclidean rotation of angle π :

$$T_a^\dagger(\alpha) = e^{-i\pi K} T_{-a}(\alpha) e^{+i\pi K} . \quad (17)$$

It is crucial for our analysis that the angular evolution of $T_\pm$ is remarkably simple:

$$e^{-i\psi K} T_\pm(\alpha) e^{+i\psi K} = T_\pm(\alpha + i\psi) . \quad (18)$$

This follows from the fact that exponential fields in (14) are chiral (holomorphic) ($e^{\pm i\beta\phi(x,y)} \equiv e^{\pm i\beta\phi(z)}$) with the Lorentz spin $1 - \frac{1}{\xi+1}$, while $J \propto e^{-\alpha/(\xi+1)}$. Also in the derivation of (18), we have to accept that integrals containing combinations of the *holomorphic* fields are not affected by rotation of the integration contour in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$.

The exact vacuum overlap $\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle$ can be written as

$$\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle = {}_+\langle \alpha_2 | \alpha_1 \rangle_+ + {}_-\langle \alpha_2 | \alpha_1 \rangle_- , \quad (19)$$

where we use bra and ket states

$${}_\pm \langle \alpha | = \langle \text{vac} | T_\pm^\dagger(\alpha) , \quad | \alpha \rangle_\pm = T_\pm(\alpha) | \text{vac} \rangle . \quad (20)$$

With eqs. (17) and (18), the formula (19) takes the form

$$\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle = \sum_{a=\pm} F_{-a a}(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - i\pi) . \quad (21)$$

Here we introduce

$$F_{\pm\mp}(\alpha - \alpha') = \langle \text{vac} | T_{\pm}(\alpha') T_{\mp}(\alpha) | \text{vac} \rangle \quad (22)$$

and use the fact that these functions depend on the difference $\alpha - \alpha'$ only (this follows immediately from the Lorentz invariance and eq. (18)).

The model under consideration does not possess P - and T -invariance. However the C -parity,

$$C : \quad \phi \mapsto -\phi , \quad \sigma^{\pm} \mapsto \sigma^{\mp} , \quad \sigma^z \mapsto -\sigma^z , \quad (23)$$

is an obvious symmetry of the Hamiltonian (13) with $h = 0$. Despite the infinitesimally small field h that was involved in our construction, we should keep in mind that the C -parity is not spontaneously broken for any $J \neq 0$. Among others this implies an absence of spontaneous magnetization (the Kondo spin is totally screened), and more generally

$$\langle \Omega_2 | \sigma^z | \Omega_1 \rangle|_{h=0} = +\langle \alpha_2 | \alpha_1 \rangle_+ - \langle \alpha_2 | \alpha_1 \rangle_- = 0 . \quad (24)$$

This yields a relation between the free vacuum expectation values (22):

$$F_{+-}(\alpha) = F_{-+}(\alpha) \equiv f(\alpha) . \quad (25)$$

The vacuum overlap (21) can be written now as

$$\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle = 2 f(\alpha_{12} - i\pi) \quad (\alpha_{12} \equiv \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) , \quad (26)$$

and since $\langle \Omega_2 | \Omega_1 \rangle = \langle \Omega_1 | \Omega_2 \rangle$

$$f(\alpha - i\pi) = f(-\alpha - i\pi) . \quad (27)$$

Notice also that we always assume that $\langle \Omega | \Omega \rangle = 1$ and therefore

$$f(-i\pi) = \frac{1}{2} . \quad (28)$$

It is expected that the Jost operators $T_{\pm}$ satisfy remarkable commutation relations, which follow from the canonical commutator $[\phi(0, y_2), \phi(0, y_1)] = \frac{i}{4} \text{sign}(y_2 - y_1)$ for the fields $\phi(0, y)$, appearing in the definitions (14) and (15). As in Ref. [23] one can show that, acting on a pair of spins by two matrices $\mathbf{T}_J^{(-)}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{J'}^{(-)}$, the Yang Baxter equation is satisfied in the form:

$$\check{\mathbf{R}} (\mathbf{T}_J^{(-)} \otimes 1) (1 \otimes \mathbf{T}_{J'}^{(-)}) = (1 \otimes \mathbf{T}_{J'}^{(-)}) (\mathbf{T}_J^{(-)} \otimes 1) \check{\mathbf{R}} . \quad (29)$$

Nontrivial matrix elements of the 4×4 matrix $\check{\mathbf{R}}$ read explicitly

$$\check{R}_{++}^{++} = \check{R}_{--}^{--} = 1 , \quad \check{R}_{+-}^{+-} = \check{R}_{-+}^{-+} = -\frac{\sinh \frac{\alpha}{\xi+1}}{\sinh \frac{i\pi+\alpha}{\xi+1}} , \quad \check{R}_{+-}^{-+} = \check{R}_{-+}^{+-} = \frac{\sinh \frac{i\pi}{\xi+1}}{\sinh \frac{i\pi+\alpha}{\xi+1}} , \quad (30)$$

where $\alpha = -(\xi + 1) \log(J/J')$. At this point, we still do not know how to perform the adiabatic limit on a rigorous base. However, arguments similar to those from Ref. [24] suggest that the Jost operators satisfy the commutation relations

$$T_a(\alpha_1) T_b(\alpha_2) = \sum_{c,d=\pm} R_{ab}^{cd}(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) T_d(\alpha_2) T_c(\alpha_1) , \quad (31)$$

where $R_{ab}^{cd}(\alpha) = R(\alpha) \check{R}_{ab}^{cd}(\alpha)$. The self-consistency of these relations for $a = b$ requires that the normalization factor $R(\alpha)$ obeys the condition $R(\alpha)R(-\alpha) = 1$. It is found to be

$$R(\alpha) = \exp \left(i \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} \frac{\sin(2\alpha t/\pi)}{\cosh t} \frac{\sinh t\xi}{\sinh t(\xi+1)} \right) . \quad (32)$$

With this choice the R -matrix satisfies both “unitarity” and “crossing symmetry” relations

$$\sum_{c,d=\pm} R_{ab}^{cd}(\alpha) R_{dc}^{ef}(-\alpha) = \delta_a^f \delta_b^e, \quad R_{ab}^{cd}(\alpha) = R_{b\bar{c}}^{d\bar{a}}(-i\pi - \alpha), \quad (33)$$

where $\bar{c} \equiv -c$, $\bar{a} \equiv -a$.

The formal algebraic relations (31) imply that the function $f(\alpha)$, defined by formulae (22) and (25), obeys the condition

$$\frac{f(-\alpha)}{f(\alpha)} = \frac{\sinh \frac{i\pi - \alpha}{2(\xi+1)}}{\sinh \frac{i\pi + \alpha}{2(\xi+1)}} R(\alpha). \quad (34)$$

Let us assume now that for real α_1 , the free vacuum expectation values $F_{\pm\mp}(\alpha_2, \alpha_1)$ (22) being considered as functions of the complex variable α_2 , are analytic in the strip $0 \leq \Im m(\alpha_2) \leq \pi$, or equivalently, $f(\alpha)$ is an analytic function for $-\pi \leq \Im m(\alpha) \leq 0$. Because of eq. (26), we should also expect that as $\alpha \rightarrow \pm\infty$, $f(\alpha - i\pi) \sim e^{-d_K|\alpha|}$, where d_K is some (a priori unknown) exponent. With these two analytical assumptions, conditions (27), (28) and (34) define $f(\alpha)$ unambiguously. The final analytical expression for the overlap is quoted in our main result (8).

Notice that similar considerations can be applied to vacuum matrix elements of the operators $e^{\pm i\beta\phi(0)} \sigma^\mp$. This yields the following prediction

$$\langle \Omega_2 | e^{\pm i\beta\phi(0)} \sigma^\mp | \Omega_1 \rangle = B_\xi (T_K^{(1)} T_K^{(2)})^{\frac{\xi}{2\xi+2}} g_\xi(\alpha_{12}), \quad (35)$$

where $g_\xi(\alpha)$ is defined by (9) and B_ξ stands for some α -independent constant. Eq. (35) can be rewritten in the form (10) presented in the main body of the text. The value of the constant B_ξ depends on the normalization condition imposed on the operators as well as on the precise definition of physical energy scale – the Kondo temperature. The conventional normalization is defined through the condition imposed on the leading term of operator product expansion of the field $\mathbf{V}(y) \equiv e^{+i\beta\phi(0,y)} \sigma^- + e^{-i\beta\phi(0,y)} \sigma^+$:

$$\mathbf{V}(y)\mathbf{V}(0) \rightarrow \mathbf{I} y^{-\frac{2\xi}{\xi+1}} \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow 0^+, \quad (36)$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ stands for the identity operator. As for the Kondo temperature, it can be introduced through the low-temperature behavior of the heat capacity of the impurity:

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} C(T)/T = \frac{\pi}{6T_K}. \quad (37)$$

With these conventions the constant B_ξ can be extracted from the results of Ref. [23]

$$B_\xi = -\frac{1}{2} \tan\left(\frac{\pi\xi}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{\xi+1}\right) \left(\frac{\Gamma(\frac{\xi}{2})}{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(\frac{\xi}{2} + \frac{1}{2})}\right)^{\frac{1}{\xi+1}}. \quad (38)$$

We recall meanwhile that another way to exploit integrability in the Kondo model is to use a basis of the free boson Hilbert space made of right moving massless kinks/antikinks [25], which are specific combinations of plane waves that scatter *without particle production* on the Kondo impurity. Such states (which are, in some sense, Bethe states in the infinite-size system limit) can be denoted as

$$|\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n; \Omega\rangle_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n}. \quad (39)$$

Here the subscript $a_i = \pm$ labels the type of i^{th} particle (kink or antikinks), whereas θ_i is a rapidity parameterizing its energy and momentum as $e_i = p_i = M e^{-\theta_i}$ with M being an arbitrary mass scale. As $\xi \geq 1$, the states (39) form an overcomplete linear set. To use them as a linear independent basis in the Hilbert space of the free chiral boson, one should chose some ordering of the rapidities, say $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \dots < \theta_N$. The price to pay in doing this is that there is now a non trivial kink-kink “scattering”. It is most conveniently expressed in terms of the Zamolodchikov-Faddeev commutation relations

$$Z_a(\theta_1) Z_b(\theta_2) = \sum_{c,d=\pm} S_{ab}^{cd}(\theta_1 - \theta_2) Z_d(\theta_2) Z_c(\theta_1). \quad (40)$$

The S -matrix here is very similar to the R -matrix. In fact, it is obtained through the formal substitution:

$$S_{ab}^{cd}(\theta) = R_{ab}^{cd}(\alpha) \Big|_{\theta \mapsto -\alpha, \xi \mapsto -\xi-1} . \quad (41)$$

Note that the finite Lorentz boost transformation produces an overall shift of all rapidities, i.e.

$$e^{-\theta K} Z_a(\theta') e^{\theta K} = Z_a(\theta' + \theta) . \quad (42)$$

This is similar to eq. (18), however the meaning of θ is a priori very different from that of α – the variable which parameterize the Kondo temperature. In fact, the α variable can be adjusted so that $T_K = M e^{-\alpha}$. (The mass scale M disappears at the end of the calculations, since physical properties in the scaling regime depend only on ratios such as $T/T_K, h/T_K$, etc.) The complete set of commutation relations for the Jost and Zamolodchikov-Faddeev operators includes also [26]

$$Z_a(\theta) T_b(\alpha) = ab \, i \, \tanh \left(\frac{\theta - \alpha}{2} - \frac{i\pi}{4} \right) T_b(\alpha) Z_a(\theta) , \quad (43)$$

where on the right-hand side we recognize the anisotropic Kondo reflection (or transmission, in the unfolded point of view) matrix [27].

As well as the vacuum overlaps discussed above, the overlaps

$${}_{a'_1 \dots a'_m} \langle \Omega'; \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_m | \theta_1, \dots, \theta_N; \Omega \rangle_{a_1 \dots a_n} , \quad (44)$$

can be obtained in a closed analytical form. Notice that our construction of the Jost operators $T_{\pm}$ essentially employs the fields on the half infinite line $-\infty < y < 0$ only. For this reason, the problem of calculation of general overlaps is most conveniently treated by the angular quantization [26]. Let us illustrate this first for the vacuum overlap.

In the Hamiltonian picture associated with the space $-\infty < \log |z| < +\infty$, the polar angle ψ plays the role of (Euclidean) time, whereas the angular Hamiltonian coincides with $(-iK)$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the Hilbert space associated with the “equal time” slice $\psi = 0$, and the Jost operators $T_{\pm}$ are understood now as operators acting in this space. Then the free vacuum expectation values (22) can be represented by the traces over $\mathcal{H}$,

$$F_{\pm\mp}(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) = \langle \text{vac} | T_{\pm}(\alpha_2) T_{\mp}(\alpha_1) | \text{vac} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_{\mathcal{H}}} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} (e^{2\pi i K} T_{\pm}(\alpha_2) T_{\mp}(\alpha_1)) \quad (45)$$

with $Z_{\mathcal{H}} = \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(e^{2\pi i K})$. We may now observe that the important condition (27) is just a manifestation of the cyclic property of the trace. Using the unitarity and crossing symmetry relations (33) it is easy to check that the sum $\sum_{a=\pm} T_{-a}(\alpha + i\pi) T_a(\alpha)$ commutes with $T_{a'}(\alpha')$ for any α, α' and $a' = \pm$. Furthermore, as it follows from (43), this sum also commute with any Zamolodchikov-Faddeev operator $Z_{\pm}(\theta)$. For this reason it is natural to expect that the Jost operators acting in the space $\mathcal{H}$, satisfy the condition

$$T_{-}(\alpha + i\pi) T_{+}(\alpha) + T_{+}(\alpha + i\pi) T_{-}(\alpha) = 1 . \quad (46)$$

Here the constant in the r.h.s. is dictated by the vacuum normalization $\langle \Omega | \Omega \rangle = 1$. As well as T_a , the Zamolodchikov-Faddeev operators can be understood as operators acting in the Hilbert space of angular quantization [26]. In this case they satisfy an important additional requirement which is somewhat similar to (46):

$$Z_a(\theta_2) Z_b(\theta_1) = -\frac{i \delta_{a+b,0}}{\theta_2 - \theta_1 - i\pi} + \text{regular as } \theta_2 \rightarrow \theta_1 + i\pi . \quad (47)$$

The formula for the vacuum overlap (i.e., eq. (21) with $F_{\pm\mp}$ are given by (45)) can be generalized for any overlap (44), namely

$${}_{a'_1 \dots a'_m} \langle \Omega'; \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_m | \theta_1, \dots, \theta_n; \Omega \rangle_{a_1 \dots a_n} = \sum_{a=\pm} F_{-a'_m, \dots, -a'_1, a_1, \dots, a_n; -a, a}(\theta'_m + i\pi, \dots, \theta'_1 + i\pi, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_n; \alpha' + i\pi, \alpha) , \quad (48)$$

where

$$F_{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_N; b, a}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N; \alpha', \alpha) = \frac{1}{Z_{\mathcal{H}}} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}(e^{2\pi i K} T_b(\alpha') Z_{c_1}(\theta_1) \dots Z_{c_N}(\theta_N) T_a(\alpha)) . \quad (49)$$

Notice that as it follows from the Lorentz invariance,

$$F_{c_1, \dots, c_N; b, a}(\theta_1 + \theta, \dots, \theta_N + \theta; \alpha' + \theta, \alpha + \theta) = F_{c_1, \dots, c_N; b, a}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N; \alpha', \alpha) , \quad (50)$$

whereas the unbroken C -parity leads to additional relations

$$F_{c_1, \dots, c_N; b, a}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N; \alpha', \alpha) = F_{-c_1, \dots, -c_N; -b, -a}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N; \alpha', \alpha) . \quad (51)$$

Also the cyclic property of the trace, the commutation relations for $T_{\pm}$, $Z_{\pm}$ and K , as well as formulae (46) and (47) can be easily translated to further conditions imposed on the functions (49). The whole set of functional relations can be then supplemented by certain analytical requirements similar to that mentioned in derivation of the vacuum overlap. Although rigorous derivation of all these conditions is lacking, one can except them as “axioms” similar to what has been done for matrix elements to local observables in integrable massive QFT – the so-called form-factor program [28].

A constructive way to calculate the functions (49) was proposed in Ref. [26]. It is based on the free field representation of the algebra of operators $T_{\pm}$, $Z_{\pm}$ and K acting in the angular quantization space $\mathcal{H}$, similar to the bosonization procedure of conformal algebras and their vertex operators in 2D conformal field theory. This approach provides an explicit integral representation for (49), which are the building blocks for the overlaps (48).

B. Toulouse limit

This section and the next provide perturbative checks of the main result (8). We start with the Toulouse limit. In this case, the problem is well known to be equivalent to two non-interacting critical Ising models with a boundary magnetic field $h \propto J$ [29]. We thus consider the single boundary Ising model.

Let $y = i t$ be the imaginary time. As before, we are going to use complex coordinates $z = x + iy$ and $\bar{z} = x - iy$, so that $\partial_z \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial y})$, $\partial_{\bar{z}} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + i\frac{\partial}{\partial y})$. The scaling regime of the critical (in a bulk $x < 0$) Ising model is governed by the following Euclidean action for Majorana-Weyl fermions ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ [30]:

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \int_{-\infty}^0 dx (\psi \partial_{\bar{z}} \psi - \bar{\psi} \partial_z \bar{\psi}) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} (\psi \bar{\psi})|_{x=0} + a \dot{a} \right) + h \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \sigma_B(y) , \quad (52)$$

where $a = a(y)$ ($\dot{a} \equiv \frac{da}{dy}$) is a boundary fermionic degree of freedom with (as it is dictated by the action) two point function $\langle a(y)a(y') \rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(y - y')$ as $y \rightarrow y'$. We have also used here the “boundary spin operator”

$$\sigma_B = i a (\psi + \bar{\psi})|_{x=0} . \quad (53)$$

Extremizing the action gives two boundary equations:

$$(\psi - \bar{\psi})|_{x=0} = 4\pi h a , \quad \dot{a} = -i h (\psi + \bar{\psi})|_{x=0} . \quad (54)$$

Eliminating a between these relations leads to

$$\frac{d}{dy} (\psi - \bar{\psi})|_{x=0} = -i \lambda (\psi + \bar{\psi})|_{x=0} , \quad (55)$$

where we introduce the parameter λ of the dimension of energy

$$\lambda = 4\pi h^2 . \quad (56)$$

It is useful to expand the fermions in the bulk in Fourier integrals:

$$\psi(x, y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk a_k e^{izk} , \quad \bar{\psi}(x, y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk \bar{a}_k e^{-i\bar{z}k} , \quad (57)$$

where the modes obey anticommutation relations $\{a_k, a_{k'}\} = \{\bar{a}_k, \bar{a}_{k'}\} = \delta_{k+k', 0}$ and $\{a_k, \bar{a}_{k'}\} = 0$. Then the above boundary equations of motion are solved by the conditions

$$\bar{a}_k = R_B(k) a_k , \quad \text{where} \quad R_B(k) = \frac{k - i\lambda}{k + i\lambda} , \quad (58)$$

and

$$a(y) = i \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk \frac{a_k}{k + i\lambda} e^{-yk} .$$

Using the contraction $\overline{a_k a_{k'}} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \text{sign } k) \delta_{k+k', 0}$, it is easy to calculate the two point function of the boundary fermion in the presence of the field h :

$$\langle a(y) a(0) \rangle_h = \text{sign}(y) \frac{\lambda}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dk}{k^2 + \lambda^2} e^{-|y|k} . \quad (59)$$

Notice that this scaling function is known since McCoy's work [31].

We can now find the two point function of the boundary spin operator. Recall that σ_B was defined by the formula (53) and therefore, as follows from the boundary equations (54),

$$\sigma_B(y) = \frac{1}{h} \dot{a}a(y) . \quad (60)$$

Using the Wick theorem, one finds

$$\langle \sigma_B(y) \sigma_B(0) \rangle_h^{(\text{conn})} = \frac{1}{h^2} (G\ddot{G} - \dot{G}^2) , \quad (61)$$

where $G(y)$ stands for the two point function (59) and the abbreviation “conn” means the connected correlation function, i.e., $\langle \sigma_B(y) \sigma_B(0) \rangle_h^{(\text{conn})} \equiv \langle \sigma_B(y) \sigma_B(0) \rangle_h - \langle \sigma_B \rangle_h^2$. The boundary magnetization $\langle \sigma_B \rangle_h = h^{-1} \langle \dot{a}a \rangle_h$ is proved to be a non-universal quantity depending on the lattice spacing ε :

$$\langle \sigma_B \rangle_h = 4h \log(2h^2 \varepsilon) . \quad (62)$$

We now turn to the partition function $\mathcal{Z}(h, h + \delta)$ of an infinite system with boundary field h everywhere except on a part of the boundary of length τ where the boundary field is taken to be $h + \delta$. Expanding the action in powers of δ , we obtain the first nontrivial correction to the ratio of partition functions

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}(h, h + \delta)}{\mathcal{Z}(h, h)} = \left(1 + \delta^2 \mathcal{J}(\tau, h) + O(\delta^3) \right) \exp(-\tau \delta \langle \sigma_B \rangle_h) , \quad (63)$$

where $\mathcal{J}$ results from two integrations on the modified boundary

$$\mathcal{J}(\tau, h) = \int_0^{\tau} dy_1 \int_0^{y_1} dy_2 \langle \sigma_B(y_1) \sigma_B(y_2) \rangle_h^{(\text{conn})} . \quad (64)$$

In order to perform the integration here it is convenient to represent the connected spin spin correlator (61) as

$$\langle \sigma_B(y_1) \sigma_B(y_2) \rangle_h^{(\text{conn})} = \frac{4\lambda}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} dm_1 dm_2 \frac{m_1(m_1 - m_2)}{(m_1^2 + 1)(m_2^2 + 1)} e^{-\lambda|y_1 - y_2|(m_1 + m_2)} . \quad (65)$$

The imaginary time integrals in (64) affect only the term $e^{-\lambda|y_1 - y_2|(m_1 + m_2)}$. They give a term linear in τ , and a term $\propto e^{-\lambda\tau(m_1 + m_2)}$, plus the term of order one that we are after. A simple calculation yields

$$\mathcal{J}(\tau, h) = \chi_h \tau - \frac{1}{2\pi^2 h^2} \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} dm_1 dm_2 \frac{(m_1 - m_2)^2}{(m_1 + m_2)^2 (m_1^2 + 1)(m_2^2 + 1)} + O(\tau^{-2}) \quad \text{as } \tau \rightarrow \infty . \quad (66)$$

The double integral in the r.h.s. equals one. Also the linear slop $\chi_h = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dh} \langle \sigma_B \rangle_h$. Finally, combining everything together, we find

$$\left. \frac{\mathcal{Z}(h, h + \delta)}{\mathcal{Z}(h, h)} \right|_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \simeq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \delta^2 / h^2 + O(\delta^4) \right) e^{-\tau \Delta E} , \quad (67)$$

where $\Delta E = \int_h^{h+\delta} dh \langle \sigma_B \rangle_h$. This concludes the derivation of (5), since $h^2 \propto e^\alpha$, i.e., $\delta/h \simeq \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{12}$.

C. Semiclassical limit

We next consider the overlap in the semiclassical limit. It is convenient to use the Hamiltonian (6),

$$\mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^0 dx \left((\partial_t \Phi)^2 + (\partial_x \Phi)^2 \right) + J \sigma^x + \frac{\beta}{4} \partial_t \Phi_B \sigma^z. \quad (68)$$

Here the boundary value of the field Φ is denoted by Φ_B . We want to do perturbation in powers of β around the “classical” case $\beta = 0$. In this limit the spin takes the value $\sigma^x = -1$, and the free boson propagates independently on J . In particular, the unperturbed imaginary time two point function of $\dot{\Phi}_B \equiv \frac{d}{dy} \Phi_B$ reads

$$\langle \dot{\Phi}_B(y_1) \dot{\Phi}_B(y_2) \rangle_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{|y_1 - y_2|^2} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty dk \, k \, e^{-k|y_1 - y_2|}. \quad (69)$$

Perturbative expansion of the partition function $\mathcal{Z}(J, J')$ for a system with coupling J everywhere along the imaginary time axis except for a part where it is J' gives an extensive contribution (corresponding to a boundary free energy), an exponential contribution (corresponding to excited states propagating along the boundary), and a term of order one, leading to

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}(J, J')}{\mathcal{Z}(J, J)} \Big|_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \simeq \left(1 - \frac{\beta^2}{16\pi} \int_0^\infty dk \frac{(J' - J)^2 k}{(k + J)^2 (k + J')^2} + O(\beta^4) \right) e^{-\tau \Delta E}. \quad (70)$$

The calculation of the integral is elementary and, using the parameterization $J \propto e^\alpha$, one obtains

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}(J, J')}{\mathcal{Z}(J, J)} \Big|_{\tau \rightarrow +\infty} \simeq \left(1 + \frac{\beta^2}{8\pi} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha - \alpha'}{2} \coth \frac{\alpha - \alpha'}{2} \right) + O(\beta^4) \right) e^{-\tau \Delta E}, \quad (71)$$

which coincides with the result (7) given in the main text.

D. Universal amplitudes

We give here the expression of the constants appearing as pre-factors in equation (11):

$$\begin{aligned} C_\xi &= (\xi + 1)^{\frac{3}{4}} \exp \left(- \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{4t} \frac{\sinh t}{\cosh^2 t} \frac{\sinh t \xi}{\sinh t(\xi + 1)} \right) \\ C_\infty &= 2^{-\frac{1}{6}} (e\pi)^{\frac{1}{4}} A_G^{-3} = 0.72209 \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where A_G is Glaisher’s constant.